

REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 15, 16 and 23 have been amended, and Claims 2 and 17 have been cancelled. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Gilman for the telephone interview with David G. Parkhurst on October 15, 2003. In the telephone interview, Examiner Gilman indicated that no amendment or new idea had been presented with respect to the limitation that the tubular risers are tubular, and not cylindrical, and did not indicate that further consideration or search was required because he did not recognize any difference between the tubular risers of the invention and the cylindrical flange of Beinhaur et al., and because of the new art presented in the supplemental information disclosure statement. The Examiner indicated that Honkomp shows a ceramic sleeve. It was discussed that the tubular risers of the invention allow potential contaminants to escape or be removed, i.e., that the tubular risers allow access for removal or cleaning such as by solvents to allow contaminants to escape or be removed. The Examiner indicated that Honkomp teaches a tubular riser in its ceramic sleeve, and that this reference would need to be distinguished. The Examiner inquired as to possible quantitative requirements from the Airworthiness Directive, and as to how the risers were mounted, and whether the risers were removable. No agreement was reached.

Claims 1-13 and 16-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from the admitted prior art in view of Beinhaur et al. Claim 1 has been

amended to recite “a plurality of tubular risers mounted to said open side of said insulating plug, each of said plurality of tubular risers having a base portion mounted to said insulating plug and an outer end portion extending from said open side of said insulating plug,” and “leaving an open portion of said base portion of each said tubular riser open and uncovered, whereby contaminants can escape or be removed from said open portion of said tubular risers of said electrical connectors.” Claim 16 has been similarly amended. It is respectfully submitted that the admitted prior art and Beinhaul et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest providing tubular risers extending from an open side of an electrical connector and leaving an open portion of the base portion of the tubular risers open and uncovered so that contaminants can escape or be removed from the open portion of the tubular risers of the electrical connectors, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 1-13 and 16-22 are novel and inventive over the admitted prior art and Beinhaul et al., either taken individually or together, and that the rejection of Claims 1-13 and 16-22 on the grounds of obviousness from the admitted prior art and Beinhaul et al. should be withdrawn.

Claims 14, 15 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from the admitted prior art in view of Beinhaul et al., and further in view of Tharman, which was cited as disclosing two layers of insulating tubing. It is respectfully submitted that the admitted prior art, Beinhaul et al., and Tharman do not teach, disclose or suggest providing tubular risers extending from an open side of an electrical connector and leaving an open portion of the base portion of the tubular risers open and uncovered so that contaminants can escape or be removed from the open portion of the tubular risers

of the electrical connectors, as is claimed. Furthermore, Claim 15 has been amended to recite “leaving said open portion of said base portion of each said tubular riser open and uncovered, whereby contaminants can escape or be removed from said open portion of said tubular risers of said electrical connectors,” and Claim 23 has been amended similarly. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 14, 15 and 23 are novel and inventive over the admitted prior art, Beinhaur et al., and Tharman, either taken individually or together, and that the rejection of Claims 14, 15 and 23 on the grounds of obviousness from the admitted prior art, Beinhaur et al., and Tharman should be withdrawn.

It is likewise respectfully submitted that Honkomp does not teach, disclose or suggest providing tubular risers extending from an open side of an electrical connector and leaving an open portion of the base portion of the tubular risers open and uncovered so that contaminants can escape or be removed from the open portion of the tubular risers of the electrical connectors, as is claimed.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application should now be in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

By: 

James W. Paul
Reg. No. 29,967

JWP/rvw

Encls.: Return Postcard

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201